Smith's Report

No. 187 *Challenging the Holocaust Taboo Since 1990* December 2011
Online at www.codoh.com

International Lawfare in Defense of Holocaust Orthodoxy

by Jett Rucker

There is a global network of lawyers and judges coordinated from offices in Tel Aviv devoted to the advancement, in their respective countries, of the interests of the state of Israel—by the agency of their countries' legal systems. Called the International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists (or IAJLJ), it reprises the much-reviled National Socialists of World War II Germany in many ways, including the use of "code language," starting with the use of "Jewish" to disguise a legal offensive in behalf of a nation-state as a religious association, complete with tax-deductibility.

In keeping with the best precepts of sophisticated propaganda practice predating even the benchmark career of *Reichsminister für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda* Joseph Goebbels, they do not neglect to artfully craft the announced subjects of their conferences, held in critical venues throughout the world at least annually. One scheduled for November in the very city that once served the National Socialists as their capital, Berlin, bears the righteous-sounding title of "Holocaust Denial and Freedom of Speech in the Internet Era."

The true and effective victims of this initiative must encompass all those who value freedom of expression and inquiry, and the truths that ultimately emerge from the rough-and-tumble of untrammeled intellectual intercourse.

As with extremist groups everywhere, the lexicon of the "faithful" suffices to distort meaning in the apprehensions of out-group observers, as the smear term "Holocaust denial" is stretched to encompass any effort at honest inquiry into any material issue concerning German-Jewish relations in the war years, particularly: (a) the number of Jewish deaths involved; (b) whether the German people or their government intentionally launched a genocidal program; and (c) whether and how poisonous gas might have been used in the purported genocide. Of course, the term "Holocaust" itself was propagated in perfect Orwellian fashion to provide a ready handle for all manner of fixing of guilt and claiming of victimhood, of which the two words just discussed are but one example.

Then appears the hallowed phrase "Freedom of Speech," as though our lawyers and jurists proposed to set about protecting or maintaining it. Make no such mistake: their purpose, a moment's reflection will clearly disclose, assigns freedom of speech the role of being an obstacle to the attainment of their purpose, and as such an

obstacle, of course, an object to be breached, overcome, obliterated to whatever extent the IAJLJ's agenda requires.

Finally, the target ambit, the Internet, is listed not as a territory to be conquered, but rather, as a period in time ("Era,") though the arena is famously populated, and used, by uncountable droves precisely as a redoubt of free speech as yet less compromised than the traditional media, all under much better control of the agents in league with whom the IAJLJ crafts its strategies. This remains to be suborned, and over time, with coordination in all the varied jurisdictions of the world, and the force of the law, guided by the sure but unseen hands of members of the IAJLJ, should suffice to bring this chaos of anarchic freedom to heel as well.

All in all, a fine demonstration of lawyerly obfuscation—here, of course, the chief weapon to be deployed. It is extensively on view in the titles of the sessions in the program, as well.

All countries, for reasons not directly related to the IAJLJ's goals, but in all cases for reasons closely comparable with the IAJLJ's in kind, already regulate the Internet, those (the Anglo-Saxon group) with public traditions of free speech displaying the most unseemly laggardliness, hence the aforementioned "Era." In one view of the undertaking, the IAJLJ wishes nothing more than to piggyback its own particulars upon initiatives already underway in countless territories and regimes where the specter of free exchange of ideas has raised its unwelcome head. From Tel Aviv, its appearance might roughly resemble that of a global game of ideological "Whack-a-Mole."

At first blush, the chosen venue of Berlin for this conference might appear ironic in view of the IAJLJ's identity and specific purpose. But, like the conference title just analyzed, it is nothing of the sort, for Germany today remains as firmly under the heel of its conquerors as it was when supine in the ruins of its conquest in 1945. Germany might well qualify as a world "leader" in the prosecution and punishment of "Holocaust denial" by its own citizens and those of other countries, on its territory and outside its territory, in its national language and in other languages. For good measure, it is a "leader" in the persecution of "war criminals" from the conflict that ended 66 years ago.

Of course, Germany has laws on its books prescribing severe penalties (but little real definition) for the offenses of both kinds, and this arrangement is in fact one of the historical approaches to be mooted in the conference for the extension of the assault on free speech into the newly opened reaches of the Internet. The title of the presentation by Tatjana Hörnle (the program misspells her surname), "Holocaust Denial via the Internet: The German Penal Code Approach," is especially chilling, but then, the Germans (Hörnle is on the faculty of the Humboldt University of Berlin) have never been as given to *Tarnsprache* (veiled speech) as their detractors have made them out to be. Further evidence of a congenial setting is found in that nine of the twenty-four persons presenting at this event are associated with German institutions or government, including the one presenting on anti-Semitism in Iran.

The infamous Wannsee Conference of January 1942, at which purportedly the organized genocide of the Holocaust was set in motion, occurred in a suburb of Berlin. This conference advances a vision every bit as horrific as that attributed to the earlier one: systematic destruction of the processes by which humanity pursues the ever-elusive Truth.

Holocaust revisionists wishing to use the Internet are but the named targets of this insidious conclave. The true and effective victims of this initiative must encompass all those who value freedom of expression and inquiry, and the truths that ultimately emerge from the rough-and-tumble of untrammeled intellectual intercourse.

Bradley Smith, Founder
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH)
PO Box 439016
San Ysidro, California

Telephone: 209 682 5327

Blog:
http://bradleysmithsblog.blogspot.com/
Smith's Report
Inconvenient History

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust, founded in 1989, argues that the Holocaust story should not be the preserve of some at the expense of others, but should be open to a free exchange of ideas for all.

NOTE: This article was sent to 1,700 individuals in the press in Europe and North America.

FRAGMENTS ANOTHER ORDINARY LIFE

Bradley Smith

*** When we got back from the VA the other night I found that my email account held 38,800 messages. That was about 38,750 too many. What to do? Well, I erased them, everything. I didn't have time to go through 38,000 emails to look for half a dozen that might be important. It went easy, took maybe an hour and then I was okay. I sat there thinking how it could have been worse when the emails started coming in again at a particularly rapid rate. I decided to let it go until morning.

The next morning there were more than 40,000 emails waiting for me. There was nothing for it. We took the machine to the fix-it shop. They did what they did and in the afternoon I picked it up, brought it home, plugged it in, and went out to do some errands. When I got back the messages were coming in fast. The next morning I had another 40,000 emails.

We're still working on it. But when you get some 120,000 emails messages in your box over three days you figure you are doing something that somebody doesn't like. What we had been doing the previous days was to draw (critical) attention to the Conference being held at Humboldt University, Berlin, sponsored by The International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists. The conference will address "Holocaust Denial and Freedom of Speech in the Internet Era."

Ya think?

*** Watching Charlie Rose on television where he is interviewing a writer who is absorbed by the importance of questions in life, especially with regard to the life of the mind. He makes an excellent case for the importance of questions. As he and Rose go on about questions I grow increasingly aware that questions play a very small role in my life, that observation plays the primary role. No better example for it than my 30 year commitment to the revisionist issue.

Observation is not a matter of the eyes alone, or the intellect alone, it is an affair of the entire body. That New Years Eve, 1979, when I first read Butz in the downtown library in Los Angeles I became aware—I observed what was surging through the body—the understanding that I was going to do something about, address, the Taboo that protected the H. story from an open debate. I had no questions. There was no conscious decision. Only the observation of what I was going to address flooding the body.

*** I note that Normal Finkelstein was born in 1953. In 1953 I was 23 years old, selling Good Humor ice cream bars in my old neighborhood in South Central Los Angeles (where they used to do the riots). I drove one of those little Good Humor trucks with the loudspeaker on the cab playing music so the kids can hear you coming. A kid or a mother would come out to the curbing, I'd stop, dismount and go around to the back where there was a little door opening into the freezer. I was biding my time, waiting to be interviewed for a position as a deputy sheriff for Los Angeles County.

A few months before, when I was still in the army hospital in Camp Cooke, California, I had driven down with a carful of other "walking wounded" to pass the weekend with my folks and boyhood friends. This time, for some reason, it occurred to me to catch the Avalon streetcar downtown to where I could make it over to Little Tokyo. I must have been hoping to find something that would compare with what I had found in Osaka when I was in the Army hospital there. The bars, the beautiful lights over the canals, the beautiful young ladies.

That afternoon when I got off the streetcar in downtown Los Angeles I made it down Spring street as best I could. There had been surgery on the right hand and the right ankle, I was still using a cane, and I was in a slow-moving mode. After a couple blocks I passed a shabby little storefront where a small sign was taped to the window. It said: "Become a Deputy Sherriff." I wrote down the number.

As it happened, it was a bad night in Little Tokyo. I recall some brilliantly colored fish in a big tank but no young ladies. It was no Osaka. But over the following weeks/months I was discharged from hospital, discharged from the army, filled out the paperwork to become a deputy sheriff in Los An-

geles County, and then went through the process of waiting. Time passed, and now it was 1953.

So there we were in 1953, Norman and me. Norman needing his bottle warmed and his diaper changed. Me needing to find a handle on the world of memory. I had a 23-year head start on Norman but that made no difference to him. Twenty years later he was discovering an intellect that was out of the ordinary, one that would contribute to making him an extraordinary writer, while I was discovering that I had missed that boat.

*** Went to the VA in La Jolla for the first routine check-up on the knee surgery. The left leg was grotesquely swollen from ankle to knee and hard as a brick. Still, it was somewhat less swollen than it had been the first ten days. The incision was still leaking a bit at the top end, but nothing like it had been leaking the first ten days. I'd thought that was normal. There were swollen blister-like outbreaks on the front and back of the leg. It was some kind of fluid, maybe lymphatic fluid, trying to get out, to go somewhere. Anywhere.

When Dr. Mercer, the surgeon, came into the office with his nurse practitioner I stood up and dropped the pants so they could compare the two legs. Mercer was stunned. There was an unusual air of theater about it. He actually groaned. It had been a mistake for him to do the surgery. Why hadn't I called? If the leg were to become infected the question of amputation would be there. Infection can begin inside the leg, it doesn't have to be visible. And with that kind of swelling there was the risk of an embolism. At one point, his elbows on his knees, he put his face in his hands and shaking his head said sometimes he thought he was never going to learn to stop taking such chances. I'd never seen a doctor behave in such a fashion. There was something fetching about it.

Then when he found that I had driven the Jeep for three hours up from Baja to keep our appointment he was astounded. You just don't do that after such surgery. I didn't know. I told him that while we were waiting in line to cross the frontier that I opened the car door on the driver's side and let the leg dangle outside. There was some pain but it wasn't killing me.

Dr. Mercer decided to give up with me, take care of business. There was one place at the upper end of the incision that had not closed and was sticking out in an odd way. He opened it with a tiny knife and when he did the interior pressure of the swollen calf was so forceful that a stream of clear fluid shot out of the opening in a beautiful arc, crossed the distance between us, and hit him in the chest. He was wearing a shirt with an open collar and the stuff splattered right into the hair. It was kind of comic and I was unable to not laugh a little. He didn't say anything. He sat up and rubbed the wetness into his chest hair. After a moment he said calmly:

"It's okay. I'm old-school."

That was kind of comic too. But I understood now that the theater was over and I kept to a grave expression. He put a little bandage on the tiny wound and said typically the next check-up would be in four weeks but we would make ours in two weeks. Meanwhile, if I found anything strange going on I was to call his nurse practitioner immediately. When he stood up to leave he smiled a little, and as he stepped past my chair toward the door he gripped my shoulder forcefully with one hand, shook it a bit, and said: "Good luck."

Altogether the session was the most human on the part of a doctor I have ever had. A little odd, sure, but. . . ..

*** Wife and I drove down the coast this afternoon to Mission, a very small place where her younger brother is building a church. He's been building it for twenty odd years now, a real church. It's the biggest building in the little place where now three of the streets are paved. A birthday party for his wife, Elizabeth, with a hundred or so guests and *chile reyenos* for supper. It's only a couple miles inland from the ocean, but in a valley surrounded by high, craggy, rocky hills. It's like being in a hidden valley in the Arizona desert.

The large dining area is full and busy and noisy. There are a sprinkling of Americans, Christian folk who come down to help with the work of evangelizing. And there is one little girl there, maybe four years old, with long red hair tied back into a single braid. She is alert, pays attention to her mother, and is pretty. My mother had red hair, a bit lighter than that of the little girl. The big dining room is full and loud with laughing and talking as Elizabeth opens her presents. I watch the pretty little red-headed girl, so much at her ease in the midst of all that ruckus and movement and in her I see my own mother as a little girl more than a hundred years ago. It's difficult to take my eyes off her.

Continued on page 15

CODOH Challenges the International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists (IAJLJ) to Work for Intellectual Freedom, Not Censorship

San Diego, CA, November 07 2011

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH) calls attention to the activities of the International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists (IAJLJ). It is holding a massive promotional event in Berlin entitled “Holocaust Denial and Freedom of Speech in the Internet Era” November 15 to 19, 20ll

The agenda of the IAJLJ is presented in a string of policy statments posted at http://tinyurl.com/3j6fzp9 IAJLJ policies include a defense of Ariel Sharon’s infamous 2000 "Strut through Temple Mount," a demand for the release of convicted spy Pollack, a call for the revocation of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3379, a denunciation of the Durban World Conference Against Racism, a demand that a human-rights conference be canceled because it "will have prominently on its agenda allegations of violations of the human rights of the inhabitants of the Palestinian territories," and a petition accusing UN Special Rapporteur John Dugard of inciting terror with his reference to “the deaths and expulsion of thousands of Palestinian civilians…”

In short, the IAJLJ is especially noteworthy for its brazen hypocrisy in masquerading as a human-rights organization while being dedicated to a notorious stand against free speech.

Unfortunately, this group is adept at soliciting governmental officials of good will to participate in its pseudo-educational promotional events by touting itself as "a membership organization whose objects are to advance human rights everywhere." In fact, the International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists now has the sinister distinction of being the most militant anti-free speech group on earth.

We are a group of historians, scholars and committed lay persons who feel that the upcoming conference in Berlin will only serve as a propaganda tool for restricting free speech and a real exchange of ideas. We understand and can respect the fact that different groups have memories and histories which are sacred to them. We understand that to even question accepted history can be controversial and even offensive to some. It is not our intent to shock or offend or "teach anyone a lesson." But forwarding a living memorial to a particular historical event is one thing, while having the freedom to examine that historical event in the routine way that all other historical events are examined is another.

Unlike the IAJLJ, we encourage the examination of history in the light of day over creating a memorial to any one specific historical event. We hold that it is the right, and the duty, of students and scholars alike to investigate and search for the Truth. The IAJLJ has successfully sold its idea linking Revisionism (referred to as "Denial") with "hate." In nearly every statement on the matter the IAJLJ uses the formula, "Combating Anti-Semitism and the Denial of the Holocaust." From our perspective, the IAJLJ is using dishonest rhetoric and misrepresentations to promote laws against what it sees as blasphemy regarding its memorializing of the orthodox Holocaust story.

The IAJLJ regularly defames Revisionists as “anti-Semites who claim the Holocaust is just Jewish propaganda.” That is not what we at CODOH argue. Briefly, we believe that much of the history we are taught today about the WWII era has been influenced by Soviet, British and American wartime propaganda which exaggerated and exploited real tragedies for the propaganda purposes of the victorious States. This concerns not just Jews but Slavs, Roma, Jehovah’s Witnesses and, in some versions, Gays. There is considerable research that supports our point of view and it should be inconceivable that anyone should be threatened with prosecution and prison for stating in public that they doubt what they can no longer believe.

We at CODOH want to encourage a progression to an age where governments can no longer pass laws mandating belief in a government-approved historical theory. The one-sided presentation of anti-Revisionist Conferences like the Berlin show have led to Draconian laws against “Denial,” laws that go against our fundamental ideals of free speech and are meant to stifle a free exchange of ideas. All people of good will, and all people who support the right of humans to speak openly about that which they

feel important, and the right to dissent from the views of the State or a ruling class, should be concerned by the activities of the IAJLJ.

Bradley Smith, Founder
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH)
PO Box 439016
San Ysidro, California

Telephone: 209 682 5327
Email: bsmith@prodigy.net.mx

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust, founded in 1989, argues that the Holocaust story should not be the preserve of some at the expense of others, but should be open to a free exchange of ideas for all.

NOTE: This letter was distributed to 1,700 free-press organizations and journalists in North America and Europe.

CODOH Urges President of Humboldt University, Berlin, to Cancel Use of Humboldt Facilities for a Conference on "Holocaust Denial and Freedom of Speech in the Internet Era", Sponsored by IAJLJ.

San Diego, CA, November 9 2011

Prof. Dr. Jan-Hendrik Olbertz,
President
Humboldt University
Berlin, Germany
praesident@uv.hu-berlin.de

Dear Prof.-Dr. Olbertz:

Through its law school, Humboldt University is hosting a conference this month whose purpose is hostile to freedom of expression. Not only is your august institution making its Grimm Auditorium available for the sessions, two members of the Law School faculty (Bernd Heinrich and Tatjana Hörnle) are *speakers* at it. I refer, of course, to the conference of the International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists of November 15 through 18, titled "Holocaust Denial and Freedom of Speech in the Internet Era."

The title is deceptively abstract. In fact, it takes little imagination to see, the subject is "Using the Force of Law to Discourage Open Debate of the Holocaust on the Internet," an agenda antithetical to the freedom of discourse upon which both universities and the development of knowledge depend.

Now, I know that in today's Germany, open debate of the Holocaust is indeed discouraged by the force of the law, and I know that

Dr. Jan-Hendrik Olbertz

Humboldt University's Law School concerns itself with the design and application of laws. But excusing the complicity of Humboldt University in this campaign of repression is like excusing the firm of Tesch & Stabenow from developing and supplying the alleged means of the deaths of millions of Jews, Zyklon-B. (I might question whether it was used for this purpose, but I suppose doing would violate German law, so I demur.) The accusation against Tesch & Stabenow and the German people themselves, of course, comes from the very interests whose conference you plan to host. And they mean to suppress discussion of these and many similar accusations—all over the world.

Just because a pesticide firm concerns itself with poisonous gases, or a law school with the administration of laws, is no excuse for the firm, or school, to knowingly abet inhuman conspiracies. Your relying on the innocuous styling of the conference's title will be rejected just as were Tesch & Stabenow's claims that Zyklon-B was for killing lice.

Germany's academy has a long and shameful tradition of serving the state in ways later shown to be deleterious to the wellbeing of mankind.

It is time for Humboldt to uphold humanitarian ideals that always have, and always will, transcend the state. Cancel the use of your facilities. Withdraw your speakers from the program. And take a stand for freedom of speech

that even today remains so sadly lacking in the heart of European civilization.

Bradley Smith, Founder
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust
PO Box 439016
San Ysidro, CA 92143
Telephone: 209 682 5327

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust, founded in 1989, argues that the Holocaust story should not be the preserve of some at the expense of others, but should be open to a free exchange of ideas by all.

NOTE: This letter was copied to 1,100 faculty members in Law and Humanities at Humboldt University.

REVIEW OF THE CODOH REVISIONIST FORUM October 2011.

Hannover

Here are some of the key topics begun by registrants of The Forum for October of this year. Rather than a verbatim back & forth I have summarized the main points made within the selected threads. Below are the statistics for the month of October. As you see, we are not talking to ourselves alone.

Unique visitors: 10,034
Number of visits: 29,678
Pages accessed: 228,383
Hits: 474,818

New Faurisson video
http://tinyurl.com/7gspnaj

- Paul-Eric Blanrue had published a new video, containing a 93-minute interview with R. Faurisson, for those who understand French
- Not much debate here, Faurisson is compelling as usual.
- A must-see example of solid Revisionist arguments.

Jewish holocaust survivor finds out he is listed as dead
http://tinyurl.com/8yeflar

- This 'survivor' has his story dissected & thoroughly debunked by those at the forum.
- The story itself speaks to complete unreliably of Yad Vashem's list of those it claims were killed in the so called 'holocaust'
- Rudolf Vrba, who allegedly blew the whistle on the Auschwitz gas chambers, has been listed as dead under his previous name
- This fact brought forth comment about the rampant name changing by Jews after WWII,
- Jews are now considered murdered under their old names, alive under their new names.
- Yet another 'survivor' of the million or so which come out of the woodwork for compensation, and their fifteen minutes of fame.

David Irving & Mark Weber, 'Enemies Of Revisionism'
http://tinyurl.com/7toh5lp

- Irving's arrogance and self praise tend to be embarrassing.
- Irving hasn't written much about the 'holocaust' and often contradicts himself when speaking of it.
- Irving apparently has stated that he does not accept the claim about Auschwitz / Birkenau, but apparently buys into the tales about Treblinka, Belzec, & Sobibor.
- The forum participants have been quick to refute Irving claims concerning Treblinka, Belzec, & Sobibor.
- Irving's support for the *Höfle document* is unsustainable.
- The "holocaust Industry" claim that Irving is the no. 1 Revisionist is a straw man, a false, but useful argument for them.
- Weber, while generally considered a gentleman, is accused of being more interested in making money, though he has done some good work in the past.
- Weber's lack of new publications indicates he's living off of his past efforts.
- some participants were less than kind to both men

Citing Nuremberg as 'proof'? But why?
http://tinyurl.com/6mdncb9

- There are many threads here which go into the Nuremberg post-war trials, but in this thread we are reminded of just how bizarre and utterly criminal the Nuremberg Show Trials were.

- Nuremberg is claimed to have produced 'proof' of the 'holocaust' as alleged, as well as provided a basis for contemporary international law.
- Nothing could be further from the truth.
- Jewish supremacists and True Believers would be better off not citing these sham proceedings.
- Most supporters of the proceedings have not read them.
- One of the masters, if not THE master of Nuremberg is Carlos Whitlock Porter. His website makes mincemeat of the claims concerning the post-war Nuremberg Trials. Be sure to have a look at it, a Revisionist must-read. http://www.cwporter.com

"Holocaust accusations fall into three categories: the impossibly ridiculous, the ridiculously impossible, and the hopelessly insane."
Carlos Porter

Confirmed by the British cremation society
http://tinyurl.com/7ql9emt

- The 'holocaust' narrative claims that the SS at Auschwitz / Birkenau could cremate gassed Jews in mere minutes.
- It is also claimed that multiple Jews were crammed into each muffle (muffle = the enclosure for the corpse) to save fuel and time.
- See the impossibility of that claim discussed as well as a damning response from the British Cremation Society via a letter that was sent to them, and their response, here is the letter:

"I am writing an essay, and it is about cremation and how it works. I have some general information regarding the process, however, I am wanting to know some technical information. In the course of cremation, is it possible to cremate a body in as little as 30 minutes? What happens if you go over the heat specified in the cremation process? I have heard of some people in the UK who were burning multiple bodies together to save money, would this not damage the ovens? And would the amount of time take less than a single cremation? I await your response, and I do apologize for asking too many technical questions.
"Sincerely, Edward."

- the following response was originally posted with the specific respondent's name, but the name has been removed for his / her well being.

"Dear Edward:
"Thank you for your enquiry. I am attaching some information issued by the Federation of Burial & Cremation Authorities, but in brief: It is not possible to cremate a body in 30 minutes; multiple cremations do not occur – a cremator can only accommodate one body at a time although a large number of crematoria have more than one cremator. Have you considered asking your local crematorium if they could give you a tour? They will be able to answer all your questions on the spot. I hope the enclosed is of assistance. Please let me know if you require any further information.
"Kind regards. [….]
The Cremation Society of Great Britain"

- Within this discussion the Brit who sent the letter states: "Also, if anyone has any doubts, they can contact the email above, or the Cremation Society of America."

The Holocaust religion
http://tinyurl.com/827f44o

- A comparison of common religious themes, pilgrimages, 'relics'.
- Saints such as Elie Wiesel & Simon Wiesenthal
- Intolerance of infidels & heretics
- Is, in the end, meant to control people, like most religions.

Diesel engines were claimed to be used! http://tinyurl.com/86par8c

- Knowing that they have again made an impossible claim, in this case that diesel fumes were used as a mass murder weapon, the 'holocaust' shysters have tried repeatedly to change their story. The problem is their attempted switch from diesel to gasoline is too late.
- They tried to change it over to gasoline engines, yet the witness in this testimony said a Russian T-34 tank was used. These are diesels.
- In discussing the Gerstein 'statements'; Leon Poliakov, who is a French speaking Jewish 'historian', said:
"there is little to add to this description [the Gerstein statement] which holds good for Treblinka, Sobibor as well as for the Belzec camp. The latter installations were constructed in almost the same way and also used the exhaust carbon monoxide gases from Diesel motors as death agents."
- According to Poliakov, more than a million and a half people were killed with Diesel exhaust. (fn. 10)
- for more on the alleged 'diesel gassings' and see why Yad Vashem would attempt to switch: http://www.codoh.com/gcgv/gcdiesel.html
- said one respondent: "I have to admire their chutzpah. The only *evidence* they have is testimony,

but the testimony doesn't fit with science, so they ignore the *evidence* and change the *facts* to fit the myth."
- Eichmann talked of a Russian submarine engine in his trial. It's in *One Third of the Holocaust*, Episode 28 at about 7 minutes 30, at: http://tinyurl.com/6vwqxwy

My experiences with "Holocaust" teaching in schools
http://tinyurl.com/6qxl6t8

- a new registrant speaks about the inner conflict he felt with regard to the teaching he received concerning the 'holocaust' storyline
- a noticeable lack of teaching about the brutality and genocide against Christians by the communists under Stalin
- a respondent said it is so typical of conditioning and 'the Big Lie' technique.
- "Repeat something long enough and the sheeple will believe it."
- one individual chimed in with ways in which this teacher could stretch the envelope by bringing up suggestive ideas such as "The most documented event in all of human history" could be questioned with "are these court-verified documents?" and "where can I read them?"
- much more

Communist Katyn Massacres reveal lack of 'holocaust' proof
http://tinyurl.com/84dr5rc

- reference to the thousands of Poles murdered by the Soviets, but was blamed on the Germans
- was accepted as a German atrocity at Nuremberg
- much later it is accepted as a communist act
- a link to the methodical, graphic, and verifiable excavations done by the Germans
- numerous international parties attended and verified the excavation
- there has never been an excavation as such of claimed 'holocaust' mass graves, never
- link posted which confirms other actions by the communists which were blamed on the Germans, http://tinyurl.com/7gyh3nt

-Excerpt:
"A Government commission has concluded that thousands of people buried in a mass grave outside Kiev were killed during Stalin's repressions, not by Nazi soldiers, the official press agency Tass reported today.
[...]
Villagers in Bykovnia broke five decades of silence to accuse Stalin's secret police after the Ukrainian government erected a monument in May 1988 blaming Nazi occupiers for the crime. The villagers in December forced Ukrainian authorities to establish the commission, saying three previous investigations had covered up the truth by blaming Nazi troops."

- another link was posted which attested to communist mass murders blamed on the Germans:
http://tinyurl.com/83ejo4o
-Excerpt:
"The single bullet hole in each skull offers the most chilling evidence that these victims - up to 300,000 by one unofficial estimate
- were killed by Josef Stalin's secret police, not the Nazis as the Soviet government claims.

Stalin's men shot people in the back of the head. The Nazis usually lined up their victims on the side of a ravine and machine-gunned them, said Mikola G. Lysenko, a retired economist who is crusading to end what he considers a conspiracy of lies."

Graf decapitates T. Kranz on Majdanek
http://tinyurl.com/85s46tg

- here we have reference to a damning indictment against the absurd claims made about the Majdanek camp
- Juergen Graf simply makes mincemeat of Thomas Kranz's claims that Majdanek was a death camp complete with 'gas chambers'
- Where does Kranz get this 80,000 victims from?
- "In an attempt to maintain some sort 'death camp' narrative, IOW, damage control, Kranz resorts to the typical Believer affinity for lying."

As you can see, it was another informative month at the CODOH Revisionist Forum. We welcome everyone and all opinions regarding the 'holocaust' storyline. Just register and give us your take on it. Our guidelines assure everyone a debate free from the usual distractions.

Regards, Hannover

My motto: ***If it can't happen as alleged, then it didn't.***

Michael Santomauro (he's *our* guy!) In The *Wall Street Journal*?

Briefly, the offices of a satirical French weekly newspaper, *Charlie Hebdo* (*Charlie Weekly*) were firebombed the first week in November http://tinyurl.com/68sq7jy . *Charlie*, which has a history of publishing cartoons and other materials offensive to many Muslims, was scheduled to publish a special edition of the paper purporting to have Muhammad Himself as guest editor. In addition to the firebombing, *Charlie's* website was hacked and replaced with an image of the Grand Mosque in Mecca and the words "No God but Allah."

These events led to an unusually public discussion in France about the issue of a free press. The prime minister, François Fillon, said: "Freedom of expression is an inalienable value of democracy and any incursion against press freedom must be condemned with the utmost force." The interior minister, Claude Guéant, said: "You like or you don't like *Charlie Hebdo*, but it's a newspaper. Press freedom is sacrosanct for the French." François Hollande, the Socialist presidential candidate, told *Le Monde* newspaper the incident demonstrated that the struggle for press freedom and "respect of opinions" was a permanent battle, adding that "fundamentalism must be eradicated in all its forms". I was rather surprised to discover such sentiments in Paris, considering the French history with persecuting and jailing those who do not follow the State line on the H. story.

When a story on the *Charlie* incident was published in *The Wall Street Journal* there were a number of comments touching on the issue of a free press during which the question of a free press for Holocaust revisionism came up. Okay. It happens. But it seldom goes any further. There is no appetite in mainline journalism in America for discussing the right of the citizen to discuss revisionist arguments in public. This time something unlikely happened. Michael Santomauro, who runs the revisionist news service Reporter's Notebook (http://tinyurl.com/7w9gtfk) entered the as-yet-unformed discussion to point out the, let's say hypocritical, statements regarding a free press by French politicos.

He received a thoughtful reply by one Alan Sherman. Here I will reproduce only the final paragraph of Sherman's response to Santomauro.

"I don't know you, nor have I read your book. I just find it curious that Holocaust deniers (shall we say "skeptics") will ply their trade as "legitimate discussion", irrespective of the mountains of evidence recorded by the perpetrators who thought the world would thank them. Contrast this with the fictitious work above where there is not even a tiny fraction of the amount of written or photographic evidence. Not to mention no living eyewitnesses. Yet, nobody ever calls slavery into question."

And here is where Santomauro posted in the comments section of *The Wall Street Journal* a 29-point outline of H. revisionist questions/arguments. I'm reprinting Santomauro's 29 points here not because they will be new to you—to the contrary—but because this kind of exchange of ideas with regard to the H. story has been *verboten* in every segment of the American press for decades now. And yet here it is—in *The Wall Street Journal*. The guys who are taking care of this section of the WSJ know exactly what they are doing, and those who supervise the guys who are taking care of this section of the WSJ know exactly what they are doing. This is nothing like an oversight. It is the result of a series of conscious decisions.

Here then is a substantial part of what Michael Santomauro published in the *Wall Street Journal*

Dear Alan Sherman:

Listed below are some of the "problems" I have with the Holocaust. Should these be cleared up it would go a long way toward my accepting it - they are in no particular order.

1) Why did Elie Wiesel and countless other Jews survive the Holocaust if it was the intention of the Third Reich to eliminate every Jew they got their hands on? Elie was a prisoner for several years; other Jews survived even longer. Most of these "survivors" were ordinary people who did not have any unique expertise that the Germans

could have exploited for their war effort. There was no logical reason for them to be kept alive. The very existence of more than a million survivors even today, some sixty years later, contradicts one of the basic components of the holocaust i.e. that the Germans had a policy to eliminate every Jew they got their hands on.

2) Why is there no mention of the Holocaust in Churchill's six volume History of the Second World War or the wartime memoirs of either De Gaulle or Eisenhower or any of the other lesser luminaries who wrote about the Second World War? Keep in mind all these were written years after the war ended and thus after the holocaust had been allegedly proven by the Nuremberg Trials? With regard to the Holocaust, the silence of these “cognoscenti " is deafening!

3) What was an inmate infirmary (and a brothel) doing in Auschwitz if in fact it was a death camp?

4) Why would the Germans round up Jews from their far flung empire, thereby tying up large numbers of personnel and rolling stock, while fighting a world war on two fronts to deliver people to "death camps" hundreds of miles away who were then executed upon arrival - wouldn't a bullet on the spot have appealed to the legendary German sense of efficiency?

5) Why after sixty years have historians been unable to come up with a single German document that points to a holocaust? Should we believe the likes of Raul Hilberg that in the place of written orders there was an "incredible meeting of the minds" by the literally tens of thousands of people who would have had to coordinate their actions in order to carry out an undertaking of this magnitude?

6) How come it is still insisted upon that six million Jews were killed when the official Jewish death toll at Auschwitz, the flagship of the Holocaust gulag, has been reduced from an immediate post war figure of 3 million, to a figure of somewhat less than one million? Why do many respond to this observation by saying, " what's the difference whether it's six million or one million". The answer is that the difference is five million. Another difference is that saying so can get you three years in an Austrian jail...just ask David Irving!

7) All of Germany's wartime codes were compromised including the one used to send daily reports from Auschwitz to Berlin. The transcripts of these messages make no mention of mass executions or even remotely suggest a genocidal program in progress. Furthermore it has been insisted that the Germans used a kind of euphemistic code when discussing their extermination program of the Jews e.g. final solution, special treatment, resettlement, etc. Why was it necessary for them to use such coded euphemisms when talking to one another unless they thought their codes had been cracked by the Allies?

8) The water table at Auschwitz lies a mere 18 inches below the surface, which makes claims of huge burning pits for the disposal of tens of thousands of victims untenable.

9) Initially claims were made that mass executions in homicidal gas chambers had taken place in camps located within the boundaries of the Old Reich e.g. Dachau, Bergen-Belsen. "Evidence" to that effect was every bit as compelling as what was offered for other camps, located in occupied Poland, yet without explanation in the early sixties we were told that this was not the case and that all the "death camps" were located in the East,.e.g., Poland, outside (some would say conveniently) of the probing eyes of western scholars.

10) No one has been able to reconcile the eyewitness accounts that personnel entered the gas chambers after twenty minutes without any protective gear and the fact that Zyklon B was a "time release" fumigant that would have had a lethal capability for at least another twenty-four hours. And that even after twenty-four hours the corpses would have themselves remained sufficiently contaminated by the hydrogen cyanide gas that they would have had the capacity to kill anyone who touched them who was not wearing protective gear.

11) Why do we no longer hear claims that the Germans manufactured soap, lampshades and riding britches from the bodies of dead Jews - could it be that in the light of modern forensics and DNA knowledge these claims are totally untenable?

12) Why do we no longer hear claims that huge numbers of Jews were exterminated in massive steam chambers or electrocuted on special grids - "evidence" of this was presented at Nuremberg - evidence that sent men to the gallows.

14) Elie Wiesel has been described as "the Apostle of Remembrance" yet in his memoir, *Night* which deals with his stay at Auschwitz he makes no mention of the now infamous homicidal gas chambers. Isn't this a bit like one of the Gospels making no mention of the Cross?

15) Virtually every survivor who was examined at Auschwitz says that he or she was examined by the infamous Dr. Mengele.

16) According to survivor testimony, hundreds of thousands of Jews were executed at Treblinka and then buried in mass graves in the surrounding area. Why is it that extensive sonar probing of these burial grounds reveals that this alleged final resting place for Holocaust victims has remained undisturbed since at least the last ice age?

17) "Proofs" of the holocaust rest primarily on survivor testimony; there is little, if any, hard evidence. The best of this has been described by Jean-Claude Pressac as merely "criminal traces". Even Judge Grey who presided at the Irving-Lipstadt Trial commented that he was surprised the evidence pointing to the Holocaust was "extremely thin". To paraphrase Arthur Butz, "a crime of this magnitude would have left a mountain of evidence" - where is it? There was more hard evidence against OJ Simpson at his trial, and he was FOUND INNOCENT!

18) Why has Holocaust Revisionism been criminalized in at least eleven countries - what other historic truth needs the threat of prison or the destruction of one's career to maintain itself? Should someone be sent to prison for expressing skepticism about the official Chinese claim that they suffered thirty-five million dead in World War II.

19) Why do the court historians insist that "denying the Holocaust" is like denying slavery or saying the earth is flat when it is nothing of the sort? The leading Revisionists are first-rate scholars who hold advanced degrees from the world's leading universities. Is there anyone comparable among those who say the world is flat or that slavery never existed?

20) Promoters of the Holocaust have expressed concerns about the remembering the holocaust once the last survivors die. Why haven't Civil War historians expressed similar concerns since the last survivor of that conflict died in 1959?

21) Survivors of the holocaust have testified that smoke billowed from the crematoriums as they consumed the bodies of murdered victims - some eyewitnesses even claimed they could detect national origins by the color of the smoke. How can this be reconciled with the fact that properly operating crematoriums do not produce smoke of any color?

22) According to the official version of the holocaust hundreds of thousands of Hungarian Jews were rounded up in mid-1944 and sent to Auschwitz where most were gassed immediately upon arrival and their bodies were disposed of by burning in huge open-air pits using railroad ties and gasoline. Why is it that there is no evidence of these huge funerary pyres in the high-resolution surveillance photos taken by Allied aircraft that were over flying the camp on a daily basis during this time period? Furthermore, why have no remains been found, since open-pit burning, even when gasoline is used, generates insufficient heat to totally consume a body?

23) All of the liberated camps were littered with corpses; is there a single autopsy report or any other forensic evidence that shows that even a single one of these deaths was a consequence of poison gas?

24) The death toll for the holocaust relies exclusively on population statistics provided by Jewish sources; has any independent demographic study been produced that shows that approximately six million Jews were "missing" at the end of the war?

25) Why do the wartime inspection reports of camps made by the International Red Cross contain no references to mass executions? It strains credulity that such monumental crimes could be hidden The only explanations are that either these crimes were not occurring or that the Red Cross was complicit in a coverup.

26) Why has there been no effort to respond to the Leuchter Report?

27) "The Holocaust was technologically possible because it happened ". Why is this intellectually bankrupt argument, which turns scholarship on its head, considered by the promoters of the holocaust as historical truth, considered a sufficient response to the mounting Revisionist evidence to the contrary?

28) What other historical truths rely to the extent that the holocaust does on so-called "eye witness" testimony - and why have none of these witnesses ever been cross examined?

29) According to the official version of the holocaust, the Jews remained ignorant of their fate until the very end, so skillful were their Nazis murderers in deceiving their victims. How can this ignorance be reconciled with the fact that the Jews have historically been as a group, the most literate and highly informed people on the planet with legendary access to the highest echelons of government?

[The above was not the end of it. I will add only a few lines of what Santomauro posted in the Comments section of the WSJ.]

-How many people know that at

Nuremberg the Germans were accused of, along with killing about six million Jews:

-vaporizing 20,000 Jews near Auschwitz with atomic energy";\\

-killing 840,000 Russian POW's at Sachsenhausen concentration camp (in one month, with special pedal-driven brain-bashing machines, no less), then disposing of them in mobile [sic] crematoria;

-torturing and killing Jewish prisoners to the tempo of a specially composed "Tango of Death" in Lvov;

-steaming Jews to death like lobsters at Treblinka;

-electrocuting them en masse at Belzec;

-making not only lampshades and soap but also handbags, driving gloves, book bindings, saddles, riding breeches, gloves, house slippers, etc. from the remains of their victims;

-killing prisoners and concentration camp inmates for everything from having armpit hair to soiled underclothing?

Peace.
Michael Santomauro

Publisher of Amazon's book that can't be sold in France**,** *Debating the Holocaust* by Thomas Dalton, Ph.D http://tinyurl.com/7jr5e8g

Did Steve Jobs Die from Starvation or Typhus or … ?

Friedrich Paul Berg
Nazi Gassings .Com
http://www.nazigassings.com/

The images to the left were taken in August 2011 a few days after Jobs's resignation as CEO of Apple due to "ill health." Jobs was clearly being reduced to skin and bone just as many concentration inmates were before they died at the end of WW2. The simple facts are that in spite of his great wealth and access to the best medical care and nutrition in the world, Jobs seemed to be dying of starvation—and **it happened (shock, horror, awe) in America!**

Was some Nazi version of Dr. Frankenstein to blame for all this? Of course not! The best food passed through his system without leaving much, if anything. If Steve Jobs had removed the top of his pajamas, would Jobs have looked any better than any of the "victims" of Bergen-Belsen or Dachau? Of course, not!

The same can be said for thousands upon thousands of terminally ill patients in any major hospital anywhere. The denial of this simple, but extremely unpleasant, fact of life is the key to promoting the most monstrous hoax of all time—the so-called "holocaust."

Holocaust insanity in the USA today is based on the dirtiest kind of racist hate propaganda::— photos of dead and dying persons found in concentration camps where every informed person knows there were no exterminations, ever, in gas chambers—and where the real mass murderers responsible were the western Allies. Years of total blockade (deliberate mass starvation of Germany and Europe) from the first day of the war, and bombing, and strafing of civilians did have their effects. That is what the pictures in an article in October's *Atlantic Monthly* (http://tinyurl.com/66gpbql) really show. Shame on Atlantic!

Was Steve Jobs a victim of fiendish medical experiments? One would certainly expect him to have undergone many questionable procedures with medications that are far from "proven"—but that does **not** suggest anything "fiendish" at all. It is merely good medical practice in a near hopeless situation. There are millions of cases similar to Jobs's case every year throughout the world. A high proportion of us will look no better than Jobs when we die—from AIDS, or cancer, or any number of slow debilitating diseases.

What is extraordinary is that these images of Jobs have become public. Normally, the dying person is tucked away in a hospital until the undertaker takes him to be restored to some kind of normal appearance for public display in a funeral parlor. That is normally the case unless the images can be used to make holocaust propaganda. Some people have no shame at all. Please read the discussion at http://www.nazigassings.com with even more images.

That Jobs was alive at all in spite of his obvious deterioration is a tribute to the good care he was receiving. If his care had been of poor quality, he would have died long before his body had been reduced as it was. That simple fact suggests that victims in Belsen and other German concentration camps at the end of WW2 were treated well under the impossible circumstances imposed by the western Allies. If any kinds of "exterminations" had been occurring, those "useless victims" would have been disposed of long before they could have ever looked like Steve Jobs.

Hillel: The Invidious Reader

Jett Rucker

I never took journalism (or "communications," as it's now known in many places), but I'd caution you, the Campus Editor, to beware the Invidious Reader. Of course, Readers, in and of themselves, are each by default a "good thing." So much for default.

There are, as might be taught in some journalism course, different types of Readers. All, by definition, have some interest in your headline. If you have, in fact, published something of actual interest (there's not much space for that, these days), you are rewarded with one of four reactions: agreement with what your publication asserts; disagreement with what you've published; and then the extensions of both, Affirmative Agreement and Invidious Disagreement.

Affirmative Agreement, in which the reader not only agrees, but is pleased to see your/his opinion published in a prominent and persuasive way that might convince other readers, or at least render their position respectable, can get you paid, promoted, and more-avidly read, unless too many other readers spot what you're doing and dismiss it as pandering to influential opinion.

Invidious Disagreement, on the other hand, is something to watch out for, for reasons ranging from professional acceptance and success all the way to the retention of your life and limbs. Invidious Disagreement implies outrage on the part of the reader that your viewpoint is even seeing the light of day, and fear that others might be persuaded by its presentation, or merely develop the unconscious assumption that such views may be presented by people who remain free to walk about in public identifiable to all in the clear light of day.

Censors, of course, both official and otherwise, do the bidding of powerful interests motivated by Invidious Disagreement, and they

operate day and night, in every language known to man, in every medium, and every place.

Including your campus.

Yes, your publication is being watched and, if it's any comfort to you, from right on campus, over at Hillel House (where, of course, you might be a member yourself, but nonetheless possibly unaware of what I have to tell you about). Worse still, what you're being watched for is not just something you might write, or one of your editors or columnists. It's about *advertisements*—specifically, a paid advertisement from the dreaded Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH).

OK, so what is it we're advertising, anyway? Thoughtcrime?

In a word, yes, at least if you take the word of Hillel and their Big Brother, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL). It's all laid out in a Manual for Action that is distributed to every chapter of Hillel (and, of course, to prospective donors, to garner that most-profitable-of-all-kinds of Affirmative Agreement, donations). Read all about it at www.adl.org/education/fighting-holocaust-denial-on-campus.pdf. It's a lesson in journalism that you *won't* get in the classroom.

Admittedly, your publication won't get rich (much less, you) carrying the miniscule ads we usually order (and get turned down for). But you *might* get into hot water—real quick, and real hot! The early end, you might well fear, of a promising career in journalism—or communication.

Before you decide against offering up your nascent career in—whatever—on the altar of Freedom of the Press for Advertisers, too, how about dropping by our Web site (the one we advertise) at www.codoh.com? If you do so, attentively, at least you'll know what you're censoring while obeying the dictates of Hillel/ADL and following the path of least resistance to a secure livelihood as a tool of the media industry.

But if you visit us with an open, as well as attentive, mind, maybe you'll see our point(s), after all. And if you still choose to turn us down, we'll understand. At least *you* won't be a victim of the censorship you perform at the behest of this Invidious (and powerful) Reader.

L'chaim, as they might say. Your health!

Sincerely,

Jett Rucker
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH)

NOTE: This letter is sent to the editor of a newspaper that has rejected a CODOH ad without what we consider due cause, and copied to readers of the paper on that campus.

FRAGMENTS

continued from page four

*** Dr. Christian Lindtner has challenged Robert Faurisson to an open debate on the Holocaust. Lindtner asserts that Holocaust revisionism is "Chutzpah," the Yiddish word for foolish or fake or pushy—as it was used in my circles years ago. Lindtner, a Dane, is not just anybody. He has held teaching positions at the Universities of Lund, Copenhagen, Washington (Seattle), Virginia (Charlottesville). His research Positions include University of Copenhagen, University of Göttingen, Danish Academy of Sciences (Carlsberg Foundation), Danish Council of Research, DAAD (Germany), etc.

Dr. Lindtner's challenge to Faurisson included this text:

"The world's absolute leading holocaust denier Professor Robert Faurisson has often complained that there is no "open debate" about the Holocaust. He has often also been helpful in making rare documents etc. available. More than six months ago I asked him five questions about the holocaust. For reasons unknown, Professor Faurisson can or will not answer these simple questions. He either talks about something else, or does not reply at all.

"In the interest of an open debate, I have now decided—after more than six months of no response—to ask the public to help the famous French scholar answer my five questions from April 17, 2011:…"
http://tinyurl.com/78wffsn

I was taken aback by Dr. Lindtner re Faurisson and revisionism. I had met Dr. Lindtner at the Holocaust Conference at Teheran in 2006. We spent a little time together, I think in the company of several others. I don't recall the content of any exchange we might have had. What I do recall about the Dr. is that he was a very agreeable guy to be around. That I liked

him. And I recall the day after the conference itself was finished, the nighttime meeting in the basement of the center where most of us were lodged, that he was one of those chosen to be a member of a newly proposed international foundation for Holocaust studies to be run out of Teheran.

So when I received Dr. Lindtner's statement about Faurisson, and his first five questions, though caught off guard by the tone and the implications of the message, I would of course want to know what questions he had put to Faurisson. It was an odd moment for me. The first question posed was:

"1. You posited in 2006: 'Neither here nor elsewhere did there exist any order to kill the Jews.' Please provide one PROOF - just ONE proof - that this statement is true!"

I have learned a great deal about Dr. Lindtner in the years following my meeting him in Teheran. It is clear that he is one of those who, like Finkelstein—and Faurisson himself—has a mind exceptionally well organized. So how Lindtner could have asked Faurisson such a mindless question was beyond me. *Prove* there was NO order? How? Who is there among us who can prove that God did not—did NOT—create the heavens and the earth?

Following my moment of astonishment that Lindtner could have been so careless, others have challenged him. Fredrick Toben, Michael Hoffman, and especially Juergen Graf. Maybe others. I have not followed the back-and-forth.

*** Three weeks ago both the grandkids got the flu. Then their mother. It was very difficult to get over. Then my wife fell victim. I was fine. They all went to the doctor, took their medicines but they couldn't kick it. Didn't touch me. I was okay. A couple months back at the VA it was suggested I take a flu shot but I declined. Who needs a flu shot? I'm heavy into supplements to keep me healthy. And then a week ago today it hit me. Knocked me out. Literally. Lost the best part of five days.

*** We are in a solid position to begin to address Stephen Spielberg's Shoah Foundation, focusing on his Academy Award documentary *The Big Lie.* We will concentrate on the 25 university campuses that offer full access to the Foundation's 50,000 "survivor" testimonies on video tape. One primary tool we will use will be to provide knowledge of, and access to, Eric Hunt's nine-part video/movie, a work-in-progress, *The Last Days of the Big Lie.*

http://tinyurl.com/79mbdq8

One reader, after viewing Hunt's segments on the diamond-swallowing Irene Zisblatt, comments with some energy.

"A requirement of all Holocaust Survivor literature imagined decades after Liberation (or escape) is that it includes at least one miracle. Dingbat Zisblatt misread the "rules of derangement" and includes a miracle in just about every paragraph.

"How could anyone listen to this screeching seagull without bursting into breath-losing guffaws or having one's head explode? I could have a more intelligent conversation with my mis-bred Persian cat, Mineunne. And this cat is retarded! Zisblatt's babbling can be likened to one on a valium I.V. drip with a spike of a 50 mg Nembutal /Demerol cocktail q.i.d. Stephen Spielberg has no shame."

*** Here we are, the end of yet another year. We never know which way the cat is going to jump. American military all over the globe, ready and willing to die for the Greater Good. Endless family tragedies on both sides of every confrontation. Christmas. Maybe it is not a time to be "merry." Maybe it is a time to take time to reflect on how we are living with our neighbors, near and far.

--Bradley

Smith's Report
is published by

Committee for
Open Debate
on the Holocaust

Bradley R. Smith, Founder

For your contribution of $39
you will receive 12 issues of
Smith's Report.
Canada and Mexico--$45
Overseas--$49

Letters and Donations to:

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Ysidro, CA 92143

Desk: 209 682 5327

Email

bradley1930@yahoo.com